UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,400	01/29/2004	Jeremy Mark Ellington		2874

7590   09/25/2007

Raymond M. Galasso
Simon, Galasson & Frantz PLC
P.O. Box 26503
Austin, TX 78755-0503

EXAMINER
CHEN, SHIN HON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/25/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>19 July 2007</u>.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-5,8-13,15,16,19-24,27-35 and 38</u> is/are pending in the application.
   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-5, 8-13, 15, 16, 19-24, 27-35 and 38</u> is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>29 January 2004</u> is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
   a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-5, 8-13, 15, 16, 19-24, 27-35 and 38 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3.   Claims 1-5, 8-13, 15, 16, 19-24, 27-35 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as

being anticipated by Bradee U.S. Pub. No. 20020095571 (hereinafter Bradee).

4.   As per claim 1, Bradee discloses a computer-implemented method for enabling users to

access a computer system, comprising: authorizing access to a computer system by a user in

response to determining the user is a non-local user with respect to the computer system, wherein

said authorizing access includes successfully verifying that the user has an active shared

directory account associated with the computer system (Bradee: [0009]: authentication is

performed prior to assigning surrogate ID to the remote user); selecting a universal local user

account of the computer system dependent upon said shared directory account (Bradee: [0009]:

surrogate ID), wherein the universal local user account has access privilege on the computer

system (Bradee: [0009]); and mapping the user to the universal local user account, wherein said

mapping enables access to the computer system in accordance with an access privilege level

corresponding to the universal local user account (Bradee: [0054]: associate surrogate ID to

users).

5.   As per claim 2, Bradee discloses the method of claim 1. Bradee further discloses wherein

selecting the universal local user account of the computer system dependent upon said shared

directory account includes determining at least one of directory services group membership

information associated with said shared directory account and access privilege information

associated with said shared directory account (Bradee: [0032]: security providers stores user

information and associated permission).

6.   As per claim 3, Bradee discloses the method of claim 1. Bradee further discloses wherein

said selecting the universal user account includes correlating a universal local user account

access level to a corresponding group membership of the user (Bradee: [0047]).

7.   As per claim 4, Bradee discloses the method of claim 1. Bradee further discloses wherein

the universal local user account is one of a plurality of universal local user accounts; and each

one of said universal local user accounts has a respective access privilege level associated

therewith (Bradee: [0054]).

8.   As per claim 5, Bradee discloses the method of claim 1. Bradee further discloses creating

said plurality of universal local user accounts prior to performing said selecting, wherein each

one of said universal local user access accounts has a respective access privilege level associated therewith (Bradee: [0055]).

9.   As per claim 8, Bradee discloses the method of claim 1. Bradee further discloses wherein several users can be simultaneously mapped to the universal local user account for enabling simultaneous access by each one of said users to the computer system (Bradee: [0054]: surrogate ID represents all users with same privilege).

10.   As per claim 9, Bradee discloses a computer-implemented method for enabling users to access a computer system, comprising: determining that a user of a computer system is a non-local status user with respect to the computer system (Bradee: [0040]); and associating the user with a universal local user account after said determining and after determining that the user has an active shared directory account associated with the computer system, wherein the universal local user account has access privilege on the computer system and wherein said associating enables access to the computer system in accordance with said access privilege corresponding to the universal local user account (Bradee: [0042]: associate with surrogate ID).

11.   As per claim 10, Bradee discloses the method of claim 9. Bradee further discloses determining group membership affiliations of the user; wherein said associating is performed dependent upon said group membership affiliations of the user (Bradee: [0042]: determining the permission associated with the user).

12.   As per claim 11, Bradee discloses the method of claim 9. Bradee further discloses

wherein associating the user with the universal local user account includes determining at least

one of directory services group membership information associated with said shared directory

account (Bradee: [0047]).

13.   As per claim 12, Bradee discloses the method of claim 9. Bradee further discloses

wherein the universal local user account is one of a plurality of universal local user accounts

(Bradee: [0054]: surrogate ID represents all users with same privilege); and each one of said

universal local user accounts has a respective access privilege level associated therewith (Bradee:

[0054]).

14.   As per claim 13, Bradee discloses the method of claim 9. Bradee further discloses

creating said plurality of universal local user accounts prior to performing said selecting, wherein

each one of said universal local user access accounts has a respective access privilege level

associated therewith (Bradee: [0055]).

15.   As per claim 15, Bradee discloses the method of claim 14. Bradee further discloses

wherein said user account selection information includes at least one of directory services group

membership information and access privilege information (Bradee: [0047]).

16.   As per claim 16, Bradee discloses the method of claim 14. Bradee further discloses wherein said selecting the universal user account includes correlating a universal local user account access level to an access level of a group membership of the user (Bradee: [0047]).

17.   As per claim 19, Bradee discloses the method of claim 9. Bradee further discloses wherein several users can be simultaneously mapped to the universal local user account for enabling simultaneous access by each one of said users to the computer system (Bradee: [0032] and [0054]: surrogate ID represents all users with same privilege).

18.   As per claim 20-24, 27-35 and 38. Claims 20-24, 27-35 and 38 encompass the same scope as claims 1-19. Therefore, claims 20-38 are rejected based on the same reason set forth above in rejecting claims 1-19.

Response to Arguments

19.   Applicant's arguments filed 7/19/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

     Regarding applicant's remarks, applicant argues that the Bradee is a local user with respect to a computer system running an application whereas the present invention is directed to local authentication of a remote user. However, the claims do not disclose that the authentication is intended to authenticate remote user. Instead, the claim recites determining whether the user is a non-local user, and the definition of "locality" can be interpreted with respect to the enterprise wide application security system in which only when a user ID transforms into one of the

"surrogate IDs", would it be considered "local" to the system. Therefore, Bradee discloses the

use of surrogate/universal ID to distinguish whether the user is "local" or not (Bradee: [0042])

and applicant's argument is traversed.

Conclusion

20.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Khan et al. U.S. Pat. No. 7152108 discloses method data transfer system with secure

mapping of local system access rights to global entities.

Braun et al. U.S. Pub. No. 20050080897 discloses remote management utility.

21.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shin-Hon Chen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3789. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Shin-Hon Chen
Examiner
Art Unit 2131

SC

CHRISTOPHER REVAK
PRIMARY EXAMINER